THE KANZAS NEWS:
Published Every Saturday Morning, at Emporia, Kansas,
BY P. B. PLUMB.
TERMS—*Two Dollars per annum, in advance.*

Rates of Advertising.

First insertion, per line, ten cents; each subsequent insertion, five cents; one dollar a line, per annum. Displayed advertisements one-half over the above rates. All transient and foreign advertisements must be accompanied by the cash, to insure insertion.

THE KANZAS NEWS.

"THE PEOPLE ALWAYS CONQUER."

BY P. B. PLUMB. EMPORIA, KANZAS, MARCH 27, 1858. VOL. 1--NO. 39.

The Kanzas News.

SATURDAY.....MARCH 27, 1858.

SPEECH OF WM. H. SEWARD,

OF NEW YORK, ON THE

Lecompton Constitution.

The special order being the bill for the admission of KANZAS under the Lecompton Constitution, was taken up in the Senate, Mr. Seward, of New York, having the floor. He said:

MR. PRESIDENT: Eight years ago we slew the Wilmot Proviso in the Senate Chamber, and buried it with triumphant demonstrations under the floors of the Capitol. Four years later, we exploded altogether the time-honored system of governing the Territories by Federal rules and regulations, and published and proclaimed in its stead a new gospel of popular sovereignty, whose ways, like those of wisdom, were to be ways of pleasantness, and all of whose paths were supposed to be flowery paths of peace. Nevertheless, the question whether there shall be slavery or no slavery in the Territories, is again the stirring passage of the day. The restless proviso has burst the cerements of the grave, and, striking hands here in our very presence with the gentle spirit of popular sovereignty run mad, is seen raging freely in our halls, scattering dismay among the administration benches of both Houses of Congress. Thus, an old, unwelcome lesson is read to us anew. The question of slavery in the Federal Territories, which are the nurseries of future States, independently of all its moral and humane elements, involves a dynastical struggle of two antagonistical systems, the labor of slaves and the labor of free men, for mastery in the Federal Union. One of these systems partakes of an aristocratic character, the other is purely democratic. Each one of the existing States has staked, or it will ultimately stake, not only its internal welfare, but also its influence in the Federal councils, on the decision of that contest.—Such a struggle is not to be arrested, quelled or reconciled by temporary expedients or compromises.

Mr. President, I always engage reluctantly in these discussions, which awaken passion just in the degree that their importance demands the impartial umpirage of reason. This reluctance deepens now, when I look around me and count the able contestants who have newly entered the lists on either side, and shadowy forms of many great and honored statesmen who once were eloquent in these disputes, but whose tongues have since become stringless instruments, rise up before me. It is, however, a maxim in military science, that in preparation for war every one should think as if the last event depended on his counsel, and in every great battle each one should fight as if he were the only champion. The principle, perhaps, is equally sound in political affairs. If it be possible, I shall perform my present duty in such a way as to wound no just sensibilities. I must, however, review the action of Presidents, Senates and Congresses. I do, indeed, with all my heart, reject the instruction given by the Italian master of political science, which teaches that all men are bad by nature, and that they will not fail to show this depravity whenever they have a fair opportunity. But jealousy of executive power is a high, practical virtue in republics; and we shall find it hard to deny the justice of the character of free legislative bodies, which Charles James Fox drew, when he said that the British House of Commons, of which he was at the moment equally an ornament and an idol, like every other popular assembly must be viewed as a mass of men capable of too much attachment and too much animosity, capable of being biased by weak and even wicked motives, and liable to be governed by ministerial influence, by caprice, and by corruption.

Mr. President, I propose to inquire, in the first place, why the question before us is attended by real or apparent dangers? I think our apprehensions are in part due to the intrinsic importance of the transaction concerned. Whenever we add a new column to the Federal colonade, we need to lay its foundations so firmly, to shape its shaft with such just proportions, to poise it with such exactness, and to adjust its connections with the existing structure so carefully, that instead of falling prematurely, and dragging other and venerable columns with it to the ground, it may stand erect forever, increasing the grandeur and stability of the whole massive and imperial fabric. Still the admission of a new State is not necessarily or even customarily attended by either embarrassments or alarms. We have already admitted eighteen new States without serious commotions, except in cases of Missouri, Texas and California. We are even now admitting two others, Minnesota and Oregon; and these transactions go on so smoothly, that only close observers are aware that we are thus consolidating our dominion on the shores of Lake Superior, and almost at the gates of the Arctic Ocean.

It is manifest that the apprehended difficulties in the present case have some relation to the dispute concerning slavery, which is raging within the Territory of Kanzas.—Yet, it must be remembered that nine of the new States which have been admitted, expressly establish slavery, or tolerated it, and nine of them forbade it. The excitement, therefore, is due to peculiar circumstances. I think there are three of them, namely:

First—That whereas, in the beginning, the ascendency of the slave States was absolute, it is now being reversed.

Second—That whereas, heretofore, the national government favored this change of balance from the slave States to the free States, it has now reversed this policy, and opposes the change.

Third—That national intervention in the Territories in favor of slave labor and slave States, is opposed to the natural, social and moral developments of the Republic.

It seems almost unnecessary to demonstrate the first of these propositions. In the beginning there were twelve slave States, and only one that was free. Now, six of those twelve have become free, and there are sixteen free States to fifteen slave States. If the three candidates now here—Kanzas, Minnesota and Oregon—shall be admitted as free States, then there will be nineteen free States to fifteen slave States. Originally there were twenty-four Senators of slave States, and only two of free States; now there are thirty-two Senators of free States, and thirty of slave States. In the first Constitutional Congress the slave States had fifty-seven Representatives, and the one free State had only eight; now the free States have one hundred and forty-four representatives, while the slave States have only ninety. These changes have happened in a period during which the slave States have almost uninterruptedly exercised paramount influence in the Government, and notwithstanding the Constitution itself has opposed well known checks to the relative increase of representation of free States. I assume, therefore, the truth of my first proposition.

I suggested, sir, a second circumstance, namely: That whereas, in the earlier age of the Republic, the National Government favored this change, yet it has since altogether reversed that policy, and it now opposes the change. I do not claim that heretofore the National Government always, or even habitually, intervened in the Territories in favor of free States, but only that such intervention preponderated. While slavery existed in all of the States but one, at the beginning, yet it was far less intense in the northern than in some of the southern States. All of the former contemplated an early emancipation. The fathers seem not to have anticipated an enlargement of the national territory; consequently, they expected that all the new States to be thereafter admitted would be organized upon subdivisions of the then existing States, or upon divisions of the then existing national domain. That domain lay behind the thirteen States, and stretched from the lakes to the gulf, and was bounded westward by the Mississippi. It was naturally divided by the Ohio river, and the Northwest Territory and the Southwest Territory were organized on that division. It was foreseen, even then, that the new States to be admitted would ultimately overbalance the thirteen original ones. They were, however, mainly to be yet planted and matured in the desert, with the agency of human labor.

The fathers knew only of two kinds of labor, the same which now exist among ourselves—namely, the labor of African slaves, and the labor of free men. The former then predominated in this country, as it did throughout the Continent. A confessed deficiency of slave labor could be supplied only by domestic increase, and by continuance of the then existing importation from Africa. The supply of free labor depended on domestic increase, and a voluntary immigration from Europe. Settlements which had thus early taken on a free-labor character, or a slave-labor character, were already maturing in those parts of the old States which were to be ultimately detached and formed into new States. When new States of this class were organized, they were admitted promptly, either as free States or as slave States, without objection. Thus Vermont, a free State, was admitted in 1791; Kentucky, a slave State, in 1792; and Tennessee, also a slave State, in 1796. Five new States were contemplated to be erected in the Northwest Territory. Practically it was unoccupied, and therefore open to labor of either kind. The one kind or the other, in the absence of any anticipated emulation, would predominate, just as Congress should intervene to favor it. Congress intervened in favor of free labor. This, indeed, was an act of the Continental Congress, but it was confirmed by the first Constitutional Congress. The fathers simultaneously adopted three other measures of less direct intervention. First, they initiated in 1789, and completed in 1808, the absolute suppression of the African slave trade. Secondly, they organized systems of foreign commerce and navigation, which stimulated voluntary immigration from Europe. Thirdly, they established an easy, simple and uniform process of naturalization. The change of the balance of power from the slave States to the free States, which we are now witnessing, is due chiefly to those four early measures of national intervention in favor of free labor. It would have taken place much sooner if the borders of the Republic had remained unchanged. The purchase of Louisiana and the acquisition of Florida, however, were transactions resulting from high political necessities, in disregard of the question between free labor and slave labor. In admitting the new State of Louisiana, which was organized on the slave-labor settlement of New Orleans, Congress practised the same neutrality which it had before exercised in the States of Kentucky and Tennessee. No serious dispute arose until 1819, when Missouri, organized within the former province of Louisiana, upon a slave-labor settlement in St. Louis, applied for admission as a slave State, and Arkansas was manifestly preparing to appear soon in the same character. The balance of power between the slave States and the free States was already reduced to an equilibrium, and the eleven free States had an equal representation with the eleven slave States in the Senate of the United States. The slave States unanimously insisted on an unqualified admission of Missouri. The free States with less unanimity demanded that the new State should renounce slavery. The controversy seemed to shake the Union to its foundations, and it was terminated by a compromise. Missouri was admitted as a slave State. Arkansas, rather by implication than by express agreement, was to be admitted, and it was afterwards admitted, as a slave State. On the other hand, slavery was forever prohibited in all that part of the old province of Louisiana yet remaining unoccupied, which lay north of the parallel of 36 degrees 30 minutes north latitude. The reservation for free labor included the immense region now known as the Territories of Kanzas and Nebraska, and seemed ample for eight, ten or more free States.—The severity of the struggle and the conditions of the compromise indicated very plainly, however, that the vigor of national intervention in favor of free labor and free States was exhausted. Still the existing statutes were adequate to secure an ultimate ascendency of the free States.

The policy of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave States began with the further removal of the borders of the Republic. I cheerfully admit that this policy has not been persistent or exclusive, and claim only that it has been and yet is predominant. I am not now to deplore the annexation of Texas. I remark simply that it was a bold measure, of doubtful constitutionality, distinctly adopted as an act of intervention in favor of slave labor, and made or intended to be made most effective by the stipulation that the new State of Texas may hereafter be divided and so re-organized as to constitute five slave States. This great act cast a long shadow before it—a shadow which perplexed the people of the free States. It was then that a feeble social movement, which aimed by moral persuasion at the manumission of slaves, gave place to political organizations, which have ever since gone on increasing in energy and extent, directed against a further extension of slavery in the United States. The war between the United States and Mexico, and the acquisition of the Mexican provinces of New Mexico and Upper California, the fruits of that war, were so immediately and directly consequences of the annexation of Texas, that all of those events, in fact, may be regarded as constituting one act of intervention in favor of slave labor and slave States. The field of the strife between the two systems had become widely enlarged. Indeed, it was now continental. The amazing mineral wealth of California stimulated settlements there into a rapidity like that of vegetation. The Mexican laws, which prevailed in the newly-acquired Territories, dedicated them to free labor, and thus the astounding question arose for the first time, whether the United States of America, whose Constitution was based upon the principle of the political equality of all men, would blight and curse with slavery a conquered land which enjoyed universal freedom. The slave States denied the obligation of these laws, and insisted on their abrogation.—The free States maintained them, and demanded their confirmation through the enactment of the Wilmot Proviso. The slave States and the free States were yet in equilibrium. The controversy continued here two years. The settlers of the new Territories became impatient, and precipitated a solution of the question. They organized new free States in California and New Mexico. The Mormons also framed a government in Utah. Congress, after a bewildering excitement, determined the matter by another compromise. It admitted California a free State, dismembered New Mexico, transferring a large district free from slavery to Texas, whose laws carried slavery over it, and subjected the residue to a Territorial government, as it also subjected Utah, and stipulated that the future States to be organized in those Territories should be admitted either as free States or as slave States, as they should elect. I pass over the portions of this arrangement which did not bear directly on the point in conflict. The Federal Government presented this compromise to the people, as a comprehensive, final and perpetual adjutsment of all then existing and all future questions having any relation to the subject of slavery within the Territories or elsewhere. The country accepted it with that proverbial facility which free States practice, when time brings on a stern conflict which popular passions provoke, and at a distance defy. This halcyon peace, however, has not ceased to be celebrated, and labor required an opening of the region in the old province of Louisiana north of 36 degrees 30, which had been reserved in 1820, and dedicated to free labor and free States. The old question was revived in regard to that Territory, and took the narrow name of the Kanzas question, just as the stream which Lake Superior discharges, now contracting itself into rivers and precipitating itself down rapids and cataracts, and now spreading out its waters into broad seas, assumes a new name with every change of form, but continues, nevertheless, the same majestic and irresistible flood under every change, increasing in depth and in volume until it looses itself in the all-absorbing ocean.

No one had ever said or even thought that the law of freedom in this region could be repealed, impaired or evaded. Its constitutionality had indeed been questioned at the time of its enactment; but this, with all other objections, had been surrendered as part of the compromise. It was regarded as bearing the sanction of the public faith, as it certainly had those of time and acquiescence. But the slaveholding people of Missouri looked across the border, into Kanzas, and coveted the land. The slave States could not fail to sympathize with them. It seemed as if no organization of government could be effected in the Territory. The Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) projected a scheme. Under his vigorous leading, Congress created two Territories, Nebraska and Kanzas. The former (the more northern one) might, it was supposed, be settled without slavery, and become a free State, or several free States—The latter (the southern one) was accessible to the slave States, bordered on one of them, and was regarded as containing a region inviting to slaveholders. So it might be settled by them, and become one or more slave States. Thus, indirectly, a further compromise might be effected, if the Missouri prohibition of 1820 should be abrogated. Congress abrogated it, with the special and effective co-operation of the President, and thus the National Government directly intervened in favor of slave labor. Loud remonstrances against the measure, on the ground of its violation of the national faith, was silenced by clamorous avowals of a discovery that Congress had never had any right to intervene in the Territories for or against slavery, but that the citizens of the United States residing within a Territory had, like the people of every State, exclusive authority and jurisdiction over slavery, as one of the domestic relations. The Kanzas-Nebraska act only recognized and affirmed this right, as it was said. The theory was not indeed new, but a vagrant one, which had for some time gone about seeking among political parties the charity of adoption, under the name of squatter sovereignty. It was now brought to the font, and baptized with the more attractive appellation of popular sovereignty. It was idle for a time to say that, under the Missouri prohibition, freemen in the Territory had all the rights which freemen could desire—perfect freedom to do everything but establish slavery. Popular sovereignty offered the indulgence of a taste of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of evil as well as of good—a more perfect freedom. Insomuch as the proposition seemed to come from a free State, the slave States could not resist its seductions, although sagacious men saw that they were delusive. Consequently, a small and ineffectual stream of slave labor was at once forced into Kanzas, engineered by a large number of politicians, advocates at once of slavery and the Federal administration, who proceeded with great haste to prepare the means so to carry the first elections as to obtain the laws necessary for the protection of slavery. It is one thing, however, to expunge statutes from a national code, and quite another to subvert a national institution, even though it be only a monument of freedom located in the desert. Nebraska was resigned to free labor without a struggle, and Kanzas became a theater of the first actual national conflict between slaveholding and free labor immigrants, met face to face, to organize, through the machinery of republican action, a civil community.

The parties differed as widely in their appointments, conduct and bearing, as their principles. The free laborers came into the Territory with money, horses, cattle, implements and engines, with energies concentrated by associations and strengthened by the recognition of some of the States. They marked out farms, and sites for mills, towns and cities, and proceeded at once to build, to plow and to sow. They proposed to debate, to discuss, to organize peacefully, and to vote, and to abide the canvass. The slave-labor party entered the Territory irregularly, staked out possessions, marked them, and then, in most instances, withdrew to the States from which they had come, to sell their new acquisitions, or to return and resume them, as circumstances should render one course or the other expedient. They left armed men in the Territory to watch and guard, and to summon external aid, either to vote or to fight, as should be found necessary. They were fortified by the favor of the administration, and assumed to act with its authority. Intolerant of debate, and defiant, they hurried on the elections which were to be so perverted, that an usurpation should be established. They rang out their summons when the appointed time came, and armed bands of partisans, from States near and remote, invaded and entered the Territory, with banners, ammunition, provisions and forage, and encamped around the polls.—They seized the ballot-boxes, replaced the judges of elections with partisans of their own, drove away their opponents, filled the boxes with as many votes as the exigencies demanded, and, leaving the results to be returned by reliable hands, they marched back again to their distant homes, to celebrate the conquest, and exult in the prospect of the establishment of slavery upon the soil so long consecrated to freedom. Thus, in a single day, they become parents of a State without affection for it, and childless again without bereavement. In this first hour of trial, the new system of popular sovereignty signally failed—failed because it is impossible to organize, by one single act, in one day, a community perfectly free, perfectly sovereign and perfectly constituted, out of elements unassimilated, unarranged, and uncomposed. Free labor rightfully won the day. Slave labor wrested the victory to itself by fraud and violence. Instead of a free republican government in the Territory, such as popular sovereignty had promised, there was then and thenceforth a hateful usurpation. This usurpation proceeded without delay and without compunction to disfranchise the people. It transferred the slave code of Missouri to Kanzas, without stopping in all cases to substitute the name of the new Territory for that of the old State. It practically suspended popular elections for three years, the usurping Legislature assigning that term for its own members, while it committed all subordinate trusts to agents appointed by itself. It barred the courts and the juries to its adversaries by test oaths, and made it a crime to think what one pleased, and to write and print what one thought. It borrowed all the enginery of tyranny, but the torture, from the practice of the Stuarts. The party of free labor appealed to the Governor (Reeder) to correct the false election returns. He intervened but ineffectually, and yet even for that intervention was denounced by the administration organs, and, after long and unacceptable explanations, he was removed from office by the President. The new Governor (Shannon) sustained for a while the usurpation, but failed to effect the subjugation of the people, although he organized as a militia an armed partisan band of adventurers who had intruded themselves into the Territory to force slavery upon the people. With the active co-operation of this band, the party of slave labor disarmed the free State emigrants, who had now learned the necessity of being prepared for self defence, on the borders of the Territory, and on the distant roads and rivers which led into it. They destroyed a bridge that free labor men used in their way to the seat of government, sacked a hotel where they lodged, and broke up and cast into the river a press which was the organ of their cause.

The people of Kanzas, thus deprived, not merely of self-government, but even of peace, tranquility, and security, fell back on the inalienable revolutionary right of voluntary reorganization. They determined, however, with admirable temper, judgment and loyalty, to conduct their proceedings for this purpose in deference and subordination to the Federal Union, and according to the line of safe precedents.

After the elections, open to all the inhabitants of the Territory, they organized provisionally a State Government at Topeka; and by the hands of provisional Senators, and a provisional Representative, they submitted their Constitution to Congress, and prayed to be admitted as a free State into the Federal Union. The Federal authorities lent no aid to this movement, but on the contrary, the President and Senate contemptuously rejected it, and denounced it as treason, and all its actors and abettors as disloyal to the Union. An army was dispatched into the Territory, intended, indeed, to preserve the peace, but at the same time to obey and sustain the usurpation. The provisional Legislature, which had met to confer, and to adopt further means to urge the prayers of the people upon Congress, were dispersed by the army; and the State officers provisionally elected, who had committed no criminal act, were arrested, indicted, and held in the Federal camp as State prisoners. Nevertheless, the people of Kanzas did not acquiesce. The usurpation remained a barren authority, defied, derided and despised.

A national election was now approaching. Excitement within and symathies without the Territory must be allayed. Governor Shannon was removed, and Mr. Geary was appointed his successor. He exacted submission to the statutes of the usurpation, by promised equality in their administration. He induced a repeal of some of those statutes which were most obviously unconstitutional, and declared an amnesty for political offences. He persuaded the Legislature of the usurpation to ordain a call for a convention at Lecompton, to form a Constitution, if the measure should be approved by a popular vote at an election to be held for that purpose. To vote at such an election was to recognize and tolerate the usurpation, as well as to submit to disfranchising laws, and to hazard a renewal of the frauds and violence by which the usurpation had been established. On no account would the Legislature agree that the projected Constitution should be submitted to the people, after it should have been perfected by the Convention. They refused this just measure, so necessary to the public security in case of surprise and fraud. The Governor insisted on this provision, and demanded of the President of the United States the removal of a partial and tyrannical Judge. He failed to gain either measure, and incurred the displeasure of the usurpation by seeking them. He fled the Territory. The Free State party stood aloof from the polls, and the canvass showed that some 2300 less than a third of the people of the Territory had sanctioned the call of a Convention, while the presence of the army alone held the Territory under a forced truce.

At this juncture the new Federal Administration came in, under a President who had obtained success by the intervention at the polls of a third party—an ephemeral organization, built upon a frivolous issue, which had just strength enough and life enough to give to a pro-slavery party the aid required to produce that untoward result. The new President, under a show of moderation, masked a more effectual intervention than that of his predecessor, in favor of slave labor and a slave State. Before coming into office he approached, or was approached by, the Supreme Court of the United States. On their docket was, through some chance or design, an action which an obscure negro man in Missouri had brought for his freedom against his reputed master. The Court had arrived at the conclusion on solemn argument, that, inasmuch as this unfortunate negro had, through some ignorance or chicane in special pleading, admitted, what could not have been proved, that he was descended from some African who had once been held in bondage, that therefore he was not, in view of the Constitution, a citizen of the United States, and therefore could not implead the reputed master in the Federal Courts; and on this ground the Supreme Court were prepared to dismiss the action for want of jurisdiction over the suitor's person. This decision—certainly as repugnant to the declaration of independence and to the spirit of the Constitution as to the instincts of humanity—nevertheless would be one which would exhaust all the power of the tribunal, and exclude consideration of all other questions that had been raised upon the record. The counsel who had appeared for the negro had volunteered from motives of charity, and ignorant, of course, of the disposition which was to be made of the cause, had argued that his client had been freed from slavery by operation of the Missouri prohibition of 1820.—The opposed counsel, paid by the defending slaveholder, had insisted, in reply, that the famous statute was unconstitutional. The mock debate had been heard in the chamber of the Court in the basement of the capitol, in the presence of the curious visitors at the seat of government, whom the dullness of a judicial investigation could not disgust.—The Court did not hesitate to please the incoming President, by seizing this extraneous and idle forensic discussion, and converting it into an occasion for pronouncing an opinion that the Missouri prohibition was void, and that by force of the Constitution, slavery existed, with all the elements of property in man over man, in all the Territories of the United States, paramount to any popular sovereignty within the Territories, and even to the authority of Congress itself.

In this ill-omened act, the Supreme Court forgot its own dignity, which had always been maintained with just judicial jealousy. They forgot that the province of a court is simply "*jus dicere*," and not at all "*jus dare*." They forgot also that one "foul sentence does more harm than many foul examples; for the last do not corrupt the stream, while the former corrupteth the fountain." And they and the President alike forgot that judicial usurpation is more odious and intolerable than any other among the manifold practices of tyranny.

The day of inauguration came—the first one among all the celebrations of that great national pageant that was to be desecrated by a coalition between the executive and judicial departments, to undermine the national legislature and the liberties of the people. The President, attended by the usual lengthened procession, arrived and took his seat on the portico. The Supreme Court attended him there, in robes which yet exacted public reverence. The people, unaware of the import of the whisperings carried on between the President and the Chief Justice, and imbued with veneration for both, filled the avenues and gardens far away as the eye could reach. The President addressed them in words as bland as those which the worst of all the Roman Emperors pronounced when he assumed the purple. He announced, (vaguely, indeed, but with self-satisfaction,) the forthcoming extra-judicial exposition of the Constitution, and pledged his submission to it as authoritative and final. The Chief Justice and his Associates remained silent. The Senate, too, were there—constitutional witnesses of the transfer of the administration. They too were silent, although the promised usurpation was to subvert the authority over more than half of the empire which Congress had assumed cotemporaneously with the birth of the nation, and had exercised without interruption for near seventy years. It cost the President, under the circumstances, little exercise of magnanimity now to promise to the people of Kanzas, on whose neck he had, with the aid of the Supreme Court, hung the millstone of slavery, a fair trial in their attempt to cast it off, and hurl it to the earth, when they should come to organize a State Government. Alas! that even this cheap promise, uttered under such great solemnities, was only made to be broken!

The pageant ended. On the 5th of March the Judges, without even exchanging their silken robes for courtiers' gowns, paid their salutations to the President in the executive palace. Doubtless the President received them as gracious as Charles I. did the judges who, at his instance, subverted the statutes of English liberty. On the 6th of March the Supreme Court dismissed the negro suitor, Dred Scott, to return to his bondage; and having thus disposed of that private action for an alleged private wrong, on the ground of want of jurisdiction in the case, they proceeded with amusing solemnity to pronounce the opinion, that, if they had had such jurisdiction, still the unfortunate negro would have to remain in bondage, unrelieved, because the Missouri prohibtion violates rights of general property involved in slavery, paramount to the authority of Congress. A few days later, copies of this opinion were multiplied by the Senate's press, and scattered in the name of the Senate broadcast over the land, and their publication has not yet been disowned by the Senate. Simultaneously, Dred Scott, who had played the hand of *dummy* in this interesting political game, unwittingly, yet to the complete satisfaction of his adversary, was voluntarily emancipated; and thus received from his master, as a reward, the freedom which the court had denied him as a right.

The new President of the United States, having organized this formidable judicial battery at the capitol, was now ready to begin his active demonstrations of intervention in the Territory. Here occurred not a new want, but an old one revived—a Governor for Kanzas. Robert J. Walker, born and reared in Pennsylvania, a free State, but long a citizen and resident of Mississippi, a slave State, eminent for talent and industry, devoted to the President and his party, plausible and persevering, untiring and efficient, seemed just the man to conduct the fraudulent inchoate proceedings of the projected Lecompton convention to a conclusion, by dividing the friends of free labor in the Territory, or by casting upon them the responsibility of defeating their own favorite policy by impracticability and contumacy. He wanted for this purpose only an army and full command of the executive exchequer of promises of favor and of threats of punishment. Frederick P. Stanton, of Tennessee, honorable and capable, of persuasive address, but honest ambition, was appointed his Secretary. The new agents soon found that they had assumed a task that would tax all their energies and require all their adroitness. On the one side, the slave labor party were determined to circumvent the people, and secure, through the Lecompton convention, a slave State. On the other hand, the people were watchful, and determined not to be circumvented, and in no case to submit. Elections of delegates to that body were at hand. The Legislature had required a census and registry of voters to be made by the authorities designated by itself, and this duty had been only partially performed in fifteen of the thirty-four counties, and altogether omitted in the other nineteen. The party of slave labor insisted on payment of taxes as a condition of suffrage. The free labor party deemed the whole proceeding void, by reason of the usurpation practised, and of the defective arrangements for the election. They discovered a design to surprise in the refusal of any guarantee that the Constitution, when framed, should be submitted to the people, for their acceptance or rejection, preparatory to an application under it for the admission of Kanzas into the Union. The Governor, drawing from the ample treasury of the executive at his command, made due exhibitions of the army, and threatened the people with an acceptance of the Lecompton Constitution, however obnoxious to them, if they refused to vote. With these menaces be judiciously mingled promises of fabulous quantities of land for the endowment of roads and education. He dispensed with the test oaths and taxes, lamented the defects of census and registry, and promised the rejection of the Constitution by himself, by the President, and by Congress, if a full, fair and complete submission of the Constitution should not be made by the convention; and be obtained and published pledges of such submission by the party conventions which nominated the candidates for delegates, and even by an imposing number of those candidates themselves. The people stood aloof, and refused to vote. The army protected the polls. The slave labor party alone voted, and voted without legal restraint, and so achieved an easy formal success, by casting some two thousand ballots.

Just in this conjuncture, however, the

[*Concluded on Fourth page.*]